

For Official Use Only

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0



SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

*FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION
TO NEW YORK TIMES RELEASE
OF PENTAGON STUDY ON VIETNAM*

*For Official Use Only
25 JUNE 1971*

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0

WARNING

Laws relating to copyright, libel, and communications require that dissemination of this publication be limited to persons having an official interest in its contents. Exception can be granted only by the issuing agency, and users are warned that noncompliance may subject violators to personal liability.

C O N T E N T S

SUMMARY	i
I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES	
West Europe	1
Asia	3
Middle East and Africa	7
Latin America	11
II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES	
North Vietnam and the PRG	13
The USSR	17
The PRC and North Korea	23
East Europe	25
Cuba	30

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- i -

FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION TO NEW YORK TIMES RELEASE OF PENTAGON STUDY ON VIETNAM

S U M M A R Y

NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

WEST EUROPE: The press and radio of West Europe have given prominent news coverage to the New York TIMES release of the Vietnam documents and subsequent developments. The volume of direct comment has been moderate. The principal British papers, including the TIMES of London, have voiced editorial support for the action taken by the U.S. papers and concern over the doubts raised about the credibility of past U.S. Government statements. Paris' LE MONDE has indicated that it sees little new in the documents as published so far. Scandinavian reaction is mostly critical of the Administration's reaction to the release of the documents.

ASIA: Editorials in the principal Japanese papers have welcomed the decision of U.S. papers to publish the materials and criticized the Administration's efforts to prevent publication. The ASAHI papers have printed extensive summaries of the three New York TIMES installments. Several Indian papers have interpreted the documents as an indictment of U.S. Vietnam policy. Saigon and Bangkok radio-TV programs have not been heard to mention the documents, but the vernacular press in both capitals has commented in a freeswinging manner. A Malaysian newspaper is to reprint the TIMES series.

MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA: Middle East radios have reported on the New York TIMES release of the Pentagon study with no special prominence and in some cases belatedly. Broadcast comment is confined to Cairo radio, and a Cairo newspaper is reprinting the bulk of the TIMES' three installments. Damascus radio reviewed a critical Syrian press editorial, and other press comment came from the UAR, Lebanon, and Cyprus. The limited comment tends to take a parochial approach, questioning U.S. motives and attitudes with respect to such local issues as the Middle East and Cyprus problems in light of the Vietnam disclosures. Israeli newscasts have reported developments, but there is no available press or radio comment.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- ii -

Algeria has provided the only monitored radio comment from North Africa, and its papers give the story more play than does the Moroccan and Tunisian press. No comment has been monitored from Africa south of the Sahara.

LATIN AMERICA: News coverage of developments has been fairly thoroughgoing, and Argentina's LA NACION is reprinting the three New York TIMES installments. Some commentators have argued that publication of the documents serves the purpose of confirming the worst suspicions of U.S. policy. Papers in Argentina and Panama have voiced concern over newspaper publication of information essential to national security.

COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

THE INDOCHINESE COMMUNISTS: Hanoi and South Vietnam's PRG have reacted to publication of the Pentagon study with only a modest volume of low-level propaganda which cites foreign sources in reporting continuing developments and interjects little independent comment. Hanoi radio first mentioned the subject on 16 June and since then has broadcast items daily, in both English and Vietnamese. The party paper NHAN DAN and the army organ QUAN DOI NHAN DAN have carried reports of developments but there is no known press comment.

The PRG's Liberation Radio first acknowledged the publication in a Vietnamese-language broadcast on the 17th. But subsequent Front attention is confined largely to rebroadcasts of Hanoi items in Liberation Radio's English-language broadcasts. In reporting some of the substance of the documents, Hanoi says that these "revelations" are merely further confirmation of long-standing Vietnamese communist charges of U.S. deception about its "aggression" in Indochina. The media did not acknowledge that the subject came up at the 17 June session of the Paris talks nor that the communists gave journalists copies of a DRV White Book on the war that Hanoi had released in July 1965.

The first known reaction from clandestine media in Laos came on 18 June when the Pathet Lao radio carried a news item on the New York TIMES' publication of the documents. The first acknowledgment from the radio of the Patriotic Neutralist Forces came on the 21st. On the 22d the Pathet Lao radio, unlike Hanoi, acknowledged that the DRV press spokesman in Paris had discussed the secret documents.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- iii -

The radio of Sihanouk's Cambodian government first mentioned the documents in a brief item on the 19th. And the first reaction from the clandestine news agency AKI came in a commentary on the 23d which said that the documents refute U.S. Presidents' assertions for a quarter of a century on their desire for peace.

CHINA AND NORTH KOREA: Both Peking and Pyongyang have remained silent on the Pentagon materials, but two communist clandestine radios sponsored by them have reacted--the pro-Peking Thai Communist Party's Voice of the People of Thailand, and the Voice of the Revolutionary Party for Reunification of Korea.

THE USSR: Moscow has devoted extensive attention to the controversy over publication of the Pentagon study since its prompt acknowledgment on the 15th. Ongoing news items cover continuing developments such as the various restraining orders imposed on the papers, the FBI's search for the source of the "leak," Secretary Laird's announcement of a security review of the study, and the President's decision to turn over the study to Congress. Moscow radio has devoted more than two-thirds of its comment on Indochina in the past week to the documents, and there have also been press articles by such authoritative writers as Ratiani in PRAVDA and Matveyev in IZVESTIYA. Soviet media have carried extracts of the study including references to the effect of the Sino-Soviet split on U.S. policy. And some Mandarin-language radio commentaries use this as a peg to repeat the standard charge that Peking's "splittist" policy harms the Vietnamese struggle.

EAST EUROPE: Reaction from Moscow's East European allies has treated the Pentagon material as confirming that the United States has systematically practiced deception and has been the aggressor in Vietnam. A recurrent theme has been that the Nixon Administration is continuing policies revealed in the documents. Where comment by the more orthodox members of the Soviet bloc has been uniformly hostile, Bucharest's reaction has been relatively restrained and has avoided direct criticism of present U.S. policy.

Yugoslav comment, which has hailed the publication of the documents, uniquely includes the line that release of the material might be a welcome event for the Nixon Administration by aiding it in shedding previous U.S. commitments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- iv -

Tirana remained all but silent on the matter until 22 June, when a radio commentary observed that the Albanians were not surprised by the Pentagon material because they had been "unmasking the U.S. aggressors" for a long time.

CUBA: Considerable Cuban comment on the "worldwide scandal" has stressed continuities between present and past U.S. policies on Vietnam. In characteristically vitriolic terms, Havana has discussed the documents as showing "the treacherous and deceitful policy which led to Yankee genocide in Vietnam."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0

- 1 -

I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

WEST EUROPE

BRITAIN The British press has given broad news coverage to the publication by the New York TIMES and other U.S. papers of the Vietnam documents. Editorially, the major papers support the action of the U.S. papers and seize the occasion to argue that Britain's Official Secrets Act has a deleterious effect on freedom of the press in Britain. In an editorial entitled "Some Beans Need to Be Spilt," the GUARDIAN declared that "the once-secret information about Vietnam published by the New York TIMES does not endanger the United States any more than the Sunday TELEGRAPH's report on Nigeria endangered Britain." The TIMES of London said that the New York TIMES defense of its action "is one that will be sympathetically followed by much opinion in Britain," especially "since revelations about the Suez crisis showed how government could actually be conducted."

On the content of the documents themselves, the TIMES, GUARDIAN, and TELEGRAPH have all stressed the doubts raised about the credibility of past U.S. Government statements. A TIMES editorial on the 17th asserted that the deception practiced in 1964 seems "to have been such that no democratic system can accept without protest. All governments find that they have to be less than frank, and all governments are deluded by their own hopes, but to go to war on a lie is a different matter."

On the 21st, another TIMES editorial, arguing that Washington should withdraw its objections to publishing the materials, declared that "the full truth will do less harm than the partial truth and will help to restore belief in the processes of American government."

FRANCE The scant available French comment is highlighted by an editorial in LE MONDE on the 17th which expressed surprise that the U.S. electorate should be astonished by the content of the published documents. The editorialist claimed that "many of the facts reported by the New York TIMES were known," having been disclosed by Indochinese communists and independent observers as well. An article in the communist L'HUMANITE portrayed the release as a serious "political scandal": "Clearly panic reigns in Washington, and Nixon is above all concerned to find the leak."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

WEST GERMANY The West German press has published extensive factual reports on the release of the documents, but available comment is scarce. FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG said editorially on the 18th that the American nation, torn apart by the Vietnam war, will now be further divided, while the FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHEIN declared on the 17th that the TIMES' decision to print this "incriminating material" demonstrates it still has confidence in U.S. democracy. The Cologne tabloid EXPRESS, under the headline "Johnson's Deceit Unmasked," argued that a government has no right to withhold information that its citizens should know before going to war on that government's orders.

OTHER COUNTRIES Elsewhere in West Europe, there is scant available comment although news coverage seems to have been fairly prominent. Vienna papers are divided, with some sharply critical of U.S. Vietnam policy ("Only the withdrawal of its forces can restore America's good name in the world"-- ARBEITER-ZEITUNG, 17 June) while others give the previous administrations credit for having acted with good intentions. A Vienna TV commentator argued on the 19th that the New York TIMES publication had done "immensely grave" damage: "What other government will any longer conclude secret arrangements with the Americans when everything may be uncovered in one or two years?"

Available Scandinavian reaction is mostly critical of Administration reaction to the TIMES release. The Swedish paper DAGENS NYHETER, recalling Woodrow Wilson's maxim of "open covenants openly arrived at," asserted that President Johnson would not have been able to pursue his Vietnam policy had he respected this maxim. Now that the American people have seen the "double-dealing and hush-hush" that went on in the White House, they can be expected to exercise a different type of control to prevent the cynical abuse of power, the paper said. EXPRESSEN claimed that the New York TIMES articles "should be a warning to a government that is responsible for the invasions of Cambodia and Laos and the continued terror bombing, and the remarkable strategy known as Vietnamization of the war."

The Finnish paper HELSINGIN SANOMAT on 18 June deplored the censorship of the TIMES, claiming that it well illustrates the truth of the old saying that "truth is the first casualty of war." The SUOMEN SOSIALIDIMOKRAATTI, after noting the U.S. Government's argument that publication of the documents may cause irreparable harm to the United States, said that "in the view of an outsider it appears that it is precisely the measures of the U.S.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 3 -

authorities to suppress freedom of speech that are really causing damage to the United States." The paper concluded with the hope that present events may contribute to "demolishing the political line pursued by the U.S. Government and the military leadership and lead to the immediate, total, and unconditional withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam."

ASIA

JAPAN Despite preoccupation in recent days with the reversion of Okinawa, Japanese news media have devoted considerable attention to the release of the Vietnam documents. Tokyo radio and television have prominently featured news reports on the subject in their major newscasts, and the Tokyo press, both Japanese- and English-language editions, has daily accorded front-page prominence to the latest developments. In addition, the ASAHI newspapers announced on 17 June that they would withhold publication of a daily feature and a regular column for one week in order to publish the gist and an analysis of the three TIMES installments already published. On 23 June the communist AKAHATA began carrying highlights of the Pentagon documents as a separate feature.

No official government statement has been monitored, and the only ruling party pronouncement occurred during a political party forum program on television in which Zentaro Kosaka of the Liberal-Democratic Party was asked by a JCP member whether the LDP had repented its support of U.S. policies in Vietnam in light of the press disclosures. Kosaka replied that personally he highly evaluated the New York TIMES release; he pointed out that in a democratic country it is possible for a newspaper to attack the government and that such a practice can serve as a safeguard for peace.

Editorial reaction in the Tokyo press has been overwhelmingly favorable to the newspapers' decision to publish the disclosures and critical of the Nixon Administration for its attempts to prevent publication. The MAINICHI newspapers in both their Japanese and English editions said editorially: "There is no doubt that the New York TIMES, in deciding to publish the documents, was convinced that clarification of the truth would eventually serve the true interests of the country. By offering evidence of the errors of succeeding governments, it had hoped to arouse public opinion both at home and abroad for an early

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- 4 -

settlement of this 'war without a convincing cause.' We believe the paper was right in its judgment."

The ASAHI newspapers in their editorials called the documents a "grim balance sheet" of U.S. involvement in Indochina. Saying the documents have proved that the Vietnam conflict has not been a "correct" war, the English- and Japanese-language editorials stated: "We want the Nixon Administration rather to make this the starting point for a decision to end the war."

The Japanese-language YOMIURI said editorially: "We can fully understand the stand of the New York TIMES. What the TIMES has done to show to the whole world that freedom of the press does exist in the United States today will help the country restore its honor, which has been impaired by its war in Vietnam."

The Japanese-language SANKEI editorial contributed the following: "If the Administration does not intend to learn from the failures of preceding administrations, but tries to suppress the people's criticism of its Vietnam policy in order to 'protect secrets,' it will commit more serious errors. There has been too much shadiness in the U.S. Government policy toward Vietnam. This has caused popular mistrust of the Administration. From this viewpoint, the courage with which the TIMES has printed the documents is of mammoth significance."

The JAPAN TIMES, alone among the Tokyo dailies which have commented editorially, took a neutral stance. After reviewing the details of the litigation so far, the newspaper quoted Judge Gurfein's decision and supported Senator Muskie's proposal for the establishment of a committee to decide what documents and information should be declassified. The editorial concluded innocuously by saying that in the United States and in other democratic countries, "There is a need to ponder upon the relationship between the freedom of the press and the requirements of any nation's security."

In a press interview, the director of the JCP secretariat Tetsuzo Fuwa used the disclosures as a pretext to attack the Sato Government, whose policies, he charged, have resulted in Japan becoming an accomplice in the "aggressive war" in Indochina. The JCP organ AKAHATA referred editorially to the release in casting doubt upon the Okinawa reversion agreement and advocating the abrogation of U.S.-Japan security arrangements.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 5 -

INDIA The New Delhi radio provided prompt news coverage of the New York TIMES release and subsequent developments. India's English-language press relied heavily on Western news reports, but a few of the leading dailies carried their own correspondents' dispatches from Washington. TIMES OF INDIA correspondent Kamath said in his dispatch of 16 June that the extensive reports made public by the TIMES have caused "a major rumpus, if not a scandal." The correspondent called the Pentagon study a "damning indictment" of the previous administration.

TIMES OF INDIA commentator Sham Lal termed the Pentagon study "a sordid story," adding that the U.S. Government, which can hardly have its nervous system intact after all the death and desolation it has brought to the people of Vietnam, must be "writhing in pain." He observed: "So far as India is concerned, the Pentagon story is one more reminder of the need for a little more realism in assessing the U.S. role in Asia, in Bengla Desh in particular."

The leftwing PATRIOT of New Delhi said in an editorial: "The Vietnam war was begun by the U.S. Government in deliberate betrayal of international obligations and filthy deceit of its own people. It is grinding down in a heroin-drugged coma, in a vast convulsion of corruption and exposures of cruelty and crime that should make every decent American hang his head in shame." Arguing that no one will believe President Nixon, the editorial said in conclusion: "The American establishment, which has been corrupted for decades by fascist organizations like the CIA and the FBI, whose heads are among the President's most important advisers, has been losing credibility both at home and abroad for years now. The TIMES exposure makes it look as black a quantity as Hitler's."

The HINDUSTAN TIMES editorial on 18 June observed: "What is frightening is the conclusion that the Indochina war and its escalation acquired an autonomous status of its own, more related to U.S. prestige than to assisting South Vietnam."

SOUTH VIETNAM Monitored Saigon radio and television broadcasts have not mentioned the publication of the Pentagon report. Saigon newspapers have carried a number of commentaries, mostly with vague references to "plots" or "conspiracies" of one sort or another. THACH DO on the 19th argued that the TIMES articles have "exposed the U.S. leaders' plot to create the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 6 -

Vietnam war." TIENG VAN on 22 June suggested that some elements in the U.S. Administration might have been part of a plot to release the documents: "One wonders whether the CIA itself released the secret documents because the CIA intends to hold other people responsible for the war now that it sees the unreasonable war must be concluded."

On the 23d, THOI DAI MOI concluded that "the American people are using every means" to compel an early withdrawal of American forces, and thus it behooves "the various political parties in South Vietnam to heighten their vigilance and, together with the entire people, be ready to cope with the new situation left to us by our allies." A second THACH DO commentary expressed the view that some "Vietnamese personalities" might find themselves in difficulty as a result of the publication: "It will be an irremediable scandal for them if, prior to the elections, they are accused of having given a hand to the Americans and of having soaked their hands in blood on U.S. orders." DUOC NHA NAM said the revelations about U.S. involvement in Vietnam as early as 1945 may have come as a surprise to Americans, but not to the Vietnamese, "because the latter know a lot more than the Americans do."

THAILAND Bangkok radio and television broadcasts have not been heard to mention the publication. The Bangkok vernacular press has provided full news accounts based on Western press agency reports as well as editorial observations. SIAM RATH in a 17 June article said the action of the TIMES in publishing the documents is "definitely not an action that constitutes a danger to national stability, because it is the direct duty of newspapers to inform the people of . . . the truth on matters that concern them. Is catching the government telling lies an action constituting subversion? Will the American Department of Justice dare to molest the press?"

THAI RATH in a series of editorials on 18, 19, and 20 June observed that the document signifies utter humiliation for former President Johnson and has caused even more discontent among U.S. opposition politicians, who accuse the government of leading the people into war through stealth and of deluding Congress and the people. A 19 June editorial in the DAILY NEWS said the case is still another dispute between the Government and the press in the United States. It praised the TIMES "for its policy of informing the people on a matter they should and must know about."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 7 -

Coverage by the English-language papers BANGKOK POST and BANGKOK WORLD was prompt and complete, but these papers relied solely on Western agency reports and refrained from original comment. The only official response came from Deputy Foreign Minister Sanga Kittikachorn at a news conference on 21 June. When asked for his views regarding possible repercussions for Thailand, he stated: "Don't let us interfere in a matter that concerns their internal affairs. Their action shows their own stupidity. Americans are a strange people. It is wiser for us not to make any comments at all as to whether it has repercussions for us or not." This remark was not reported, however, by the radio or local press, although several papers reported on other statements made by Sanga at the same news conference.

OTHER COUNTRIES No comment has been monitored from Nationalist China and South Korea media; news coverage has been modest in volume. The Cambodian radio has not been heard to mention developments.

The Kuala Lumpur, Djakarta, and Karachi radios have provided scanty news coverage, without comment, in monitored broadcasts. The STRAITS TIMES, published in Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, announced to its readers that the New York TIMES series would be published exclusively in the SUNDAY MAIL, an associated English-language paper, starting 20 June. In an editorial, the STRAITS TIMES said that the disclosures by the New York TIMES do not directly endanger national security, nor put American troops at risk, but it questioned whether this was the "right time" to publish these documents. The paper added: "Ironically, this honesty has rebounded, recoiling not against the Administration whose conspiracy is denounced, but its successors who are engaged in withdrawal."

MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA

THE UAR A Cairo domestic service commentary on the 16th asserted that the documents prove that President Johnson deceived the people by giving them false information "to draw the United States into the Vietnam war," and it wondered when his "real role" in the Middle East would be exposed. The commentary referred to "talk at the time" about U.S.-Israeli collusion in 1967 and recalled that efforts to conceal the "tripartite collusion" in 1956 proved futile. Another Cairo commentary, on the 20th, said the documents show that despite

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 8 -

the United States' colossal power it is unable to suppress the Vietnamese revolutionary will, and it asked if the United States would abandon its "secret measures in the Far East to support an outcast minority and in the Middle East to support a racial entity foreign to the area." A Voice of the Arabs commentary on the 21st mentioned the issue in passing, claiming "it is certain there are many confidential documents between Washington and Tel Aviv" on the same pattern as those revealed in the New York TIMES in connection with U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war.

AL-AHARAM on 17 June began serializing "most of the secret study and many of the appended documents," having obtained "the right to publish these documents under an agreement" with the TIMES. The paper provided a frontpage introduction and has continued the series, with photographs and maps on inside pages, on 19, 20, and 21 June. AL-JUMHURIYAH in two commentaries stressed President Johnson's "duplicity" and linked this aspect to alleged U.S. secret involvement in the 1967 Middle East war.

SYRIA The only public reference to the issue by a Middle East leader comes from Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad in his 23 June address at the opening of an Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization meeting in Damascus. In line with the general tenor of the limited Arab comment, al-Asad stated that the day would come when "the facts about the imperialist role in the aggression against the Arab people will be exposed, just as the American press has uncovered the plotting of the U.S. ruling establishment against the Vietnamese people and their deceiving the American people."

While Damascus radio has not originated any comment, the broadcast press review on the 21st reported an AL-BA'TH editorial as declaring that "the lie" the United States used as an excuse to invade Indochina "is the same lie the United States always used as justification for countering liberation movements" and for its "support of world Zionism and its aggression against the Arab people."

LEBANON Beirut radio, which has not commented, includes in its routine news coverage reports on the court proceedings against the New York TIMES and the Washington POST. AL-MUHARRIR on 17 June began serializing the documents which it said "Cairo's AL-AHARAM obtained." According to AL-ANWAR on the 19th, the American people now know that their government lied to them about the air raids on Hanoi, and will soon know that their government took from them "billions of dollars to send to Israel to be used

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 9 -

for the expulsion of a people from their homeland." The paper claimed that the U.S. system is no longer capable of serving the American people but rather serves an "imperialist policy from which only Israel and a few agent governments" benefit. AN-NAHAR commented on the 17th that a chain of presidential decisions "taken for God only knows what reason" led to U.S. intervention in Vietnam and Indochina which culminated "in a conspiracy based on falsifications, lies, and deception."

ISRAEL No Israeli radio comment has been monitored, and broadcast press reviews have carried no press comment on the Pentagon study. News broadcasts, beginning on the 15th, have reported developments almost daily, touching on the reaction of several Senators and the legal actions halting further press publication of the materials. The Tel Aviv Forces Radio has not been heard to mention the subject.

CYPRUS KHARAVYI, organ of the Cypriot communist party, said on the 17th that the sole conclusion to be drawn from the published documents has been summed up by leading U.S. figures, and cited Senator Humphrey, among others, as saying the documents proved that the Johnson Administration involved the United States in the war through deceit. The paper concluded that despite the "gagging of the New York TIMES," the American people's opposition to the war in Indochina will be intensified. The Greek-language TA NEA on the 17th linked the issue with the Cyprus question, remarking in an editorial that the practice of deceit "proves how careful people must be when they are given assurances not followed up by substantial measures--as is the case with the U.S. approach to the Cyprus question."

IRAN Teheran radio on the 18th discussed the essence of the Pentagon study, the actions against the New York TIMES, and the effect of the disclosure on U.S. politics in light of next year's elections. The radio observed that while the documents reflect mainly against the Democrats, criticism will also be aimed at U.S. institutions and laws, including "the extensive powers of the U.S. President," and it saw a second issue in the threat to freedom of the press.

The Persian-language communist clandestine Radio Iran Courier, in a commentary on the 21st, asserted that publication of the Pentagon study posed the question of whether or not existing Iranian-U.S. agreements could be regarded as valid. It asked if there might be a danger of repetition of "such sham incidents"

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT

25 JUNE 1971

- 10 -

as that in the Tonkin Gulf occurring near Iranian shores, and if the "U.S. military advisers in the Iranian armed forces could not plunge our country into a bloody involvement similar to that of Vietnam."

TURKEY Ankara radio, which carried its first monitored report on the Pentagon study on the 19th, gives scanty attention to the story and little coverage to the documents. Brief news items have followed legal developments in the court action to halt publication and noted that the President would submit the secret documents to Congress.

The Turkish-language communist clandestine "Our Radio" asserted on the 23d that the "fascist Erim government" took a step "even beyond its Washington masters" and banned publication of the documents in Turkish papers, as well as the broadcast of news items on the subject over Turkish radios. Commentaries by "Our Radio" have stressed the "duplicity" of U.S. leaders without relating the Pentagon study issue to any Turkish or Middle East questions.

NORTH AFRICA Of the Maghreb press, Algerian papers have given more prominent coverage to the publication of the Pentagon study than those of Morocco and Tunisia. All three draw on news agencies for material on the documents and reaction abroad. There is no available comment from Libyan media. The only monitored broadcast comment comes from Algiers radio, which on 17 June claimed that the "violent reaction" of the Nixon Administration to publication of the documents was dictated by concern over the next presidential election. The choice before the Administration, the radio said, is to decide in favor of peace by giving a precise date for withdrawal from Vietnam or to continue the war, "in which case it cannot count on public opinion, which prefers peace." The commentary concluded that the silent majority on which Nixon thought he could depend "has now considerably diminished."

AFRICA No comment has been monitored from Africa south of the Sahara. News coverage by local radios has been modest in volume and factual in content.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 11 -

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA The principal Buenos Aires dailies gave the New York TIMES release extensive news coverage, and LA NACION commenced on the 18th to reprint the series of TIMES articles. On the same day LA PRENSA published a commentary by its New York correspondent, who said the developments will serve to inflame hawk-dove and Republican-Democratic battles. He reported that the U.S. press is divided over the issue of freedom of the press to publish anything it sees fit, since "it can also be said that without national security freedom of the press is also in danger."

BRAZIL The Brazilian press and radio provided extensive news coverage, but there was no comment. The Brasilia radio in a feature "congressional report" program quoted an opposition deputy's remark to the effect that the U.S. Government's resort to the courts shows its respect for freedom of the press and the rights of the press; the Brazilian Government should adopt a similar attitude toward the press, he implied.

CHILE Initial press reaction was mostly limited to reprinting of wire service news items. LA TERCERA DE LA HORA carried an editorial applauding the TIMES for its action and concluding that there is "nothing more enlightening for democracies than this trial taking place in the United States."

COLOMBIA The Bogota dailies provided fairly broad news coverage, mostly from UPI. EL SIGLO reviewed developments in a brief editorial on the 16th, concluding that ultimately "positive results" in regard to "strengthening and purifying" the U.S. system of government will ensue. A column in the 17 June EL ESPECTADOR stated that, since the TIMES has often evidenced its sense of responsibility, it is "almost certain that the true reason for preventing publication" of the Vietnam documents is to "avoid further discredit of the war and the Administration." An editorial in the same paper asserted that the documents "merely confirm what world political opinion" has suspected or known for a long time--that the "Vietnam venture constitutes one of the biggest mistakes of U.S. foreign policy." In a later editorial on 19 June, EL ESPECTADOR stated that what has been published is sufficient to judge that the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- 12 -

"failings of this war come from far back, from political errors, poor military calculations, and sometimes pure bad luck, and in any case from having tried to force solutions where there was no way out but the political way."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC There was considerable radio reportage but little comment. One radio commentator on the 18th said that the matter of the court injunction "will put on trial the integrity, solvency, and the reliability of the U.S. juridical institutions and will set a very important precedent, not only for U.S. political democracy but also for other nations within the U.S. area of influence where copying the U.S. way of life is common." In a radio interview on the 20th, Juan Bosch, former Dominican president, declared: "The publication of these documents bares before the American people and the world the fact that the so-called U.S. democracy is not the democracy that they have tried to make the people believe."

PANAMA The Panamanian radio and press gave full news coverage. A columnist in EL MATUTINO on 18 June observed that publication of the documents has produced "a crisis of nerves" in Washington since the information is so delicate that it could cause serious difficulties with foreign governments and undermine confidence in the U.S. Government. The columnist said that President Nixon is no censor and has the highest respect for freedom of the press; since the nation and its foreign policy is being affected, the President's efforts through legal means to halt publication of the documents cannot be construed as obstructing press freedom.

LA ESTRELLA DE PANAMA in a 21 June editorial stated that although freedom of the press has been "zealously maintained and respected in the United States," in certain cases U.S. publications have indulged in "evident indiscretions" and one must not forget that rights have "precise limits which cannot be surpassed without hurting other people or institutions." The paper argued that it cannot be denied that the U.S. authorities have the right to "consider unwise and even dangerous for national security" the publication of secret documents; what has already been published has given "the communists material for propaganda which they will try to exploit to the utmost."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 13 -

II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

NORTH VIETNAM AND THE PRG

The initial Hanoi broadcast on 16 June told the North Vietnamese audience that the New York TIMES on the 13th carried excerpts from a Defense Department "secret report" which had been requested by former Defense Secretary McNamara. The broadcast said that the report of "40 volumes" contained evidence that the United States had begun to be involved in Indochina before the French withdrawal and that plans to bomb the North had been prepared about five months before the Gulf of Tonkin incident. It went on to report Senator McGovern's charge that the Pentagon study contains "proof" that President Johnson had deceived the American people and Congress, and to observe that the report has caused the Nixon Government "extreme embarrassment." It noted in conclusion that the Justice Department had asked the New York TIMES to stop publishing the report and return it to the Defense Department but that the newspaper rejected the request "in the interests of the American people."

A later Hanoi broadcast on the same day--in English to U.S. servicemen--reported that the TIMES had published the second installment of the article on the 14th. It said that "shocked by the disclosure," Senator Symington had called for a "full congressional investigation" into the war.

A Hanoi domestic service broadcast on the 17th noted some details of the report, observing that the United States had been waging a "secret war" against the DRV, and that 10 weeks before the Tonkin Gulf incident the Administration drafted a resolution for Congress to adopt "that would have authorized it to take any necessary measures, including the use of armed forces in South Vietnam." It also referred to the carrying out of commando raids in North Vietnam. Noting that the third part of the TIMES' series dealt with the introduction of "massive" U.S. troops into South Vietnam, the broadcast said that on 1 April 1965 the President decided to use U.S. troops in South Vietnam "because the U.S. Administration realized that bombings in North Vietnam could not prevent defeat in South Vietnam but the President ordered that this fact be kept secret."

The only available substantial account of Hanoi press attention to the Pentagon study is in a Hanoi English-language broadcast

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 14 -

to Southeast Asia on the 17th. It reported that NHAN DAN that day, "quoting the gist" of the Pentagon study, noted that the "truth expressed" in the document "shed more light on the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression and . . . exposed the truth on the futile allegations used by the U.S. authorities to whitewash the war." The paper said that "these odious actions" committed by the U.S. imperialists have been denounced long since by the Vietnamese people and that the publication of the study "helped the Americans and others in the world to see more clearly the U.S. imperialists' policy of barbaric aggression and its futile tricks concerning the Vietnam problem." The paper also reportedly said that U.S. public opinion "has been aroused to hot discussions" about the study. The VNA press reviews noted on five occasions that NHAN DAN and QUAN DOI NHAN DAN were carrying reports of the publication controversy--on 20 and 22 June and 18, 23 and 24 June respectively. But no details of these reports have been broadcast.

A Hanoi domestic service broadcast on the 18th observed that Congress had "reacted vigorously" to the Justice Department's attempts to prohibit the TIMES from continuing to publish the document. It noted that 62 Congressmen, mostly Democrats, had sent a letter of protest to Secretaries Mitchell and Laird and that they demanded that the Defense Department make copies of the classified document available to Congress. Another domestic broadcast on the 18th said that U.S. rulers "are bewildered and confused" by the publishing of the document and that according to the U.S. press FBI agents had begun an investigation on "why and where copies" of the documents were given to the New York TIMES. And it also noted "strong criticism" of the decision to force the TIMES to temporarily cease publication of the report, quoting such Senators as Church, McGovern, Mansfield and Kennedy in this regard.

Hanoi broadcasts on the 21st and 22d also cited congressional reaction, including Senator Fulbright's comment that the document's publication was in the national interest. Senator Muskie was quoted as saying that the Administration's prohibition on publishing the documents exemplifies the "serious credibility crisis" of 1971, and that "it is necessary to call former President Johnson to testify" before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- 15 -

A Hanoi Vietnamese-language broadcast to the South on the 20th reported that on the 18th, the Washington POST had carried the first of a series of articles on the study. And a domestic broadcast on the same day acknowledged some of the substance of the POST article on U.S. attempts to prevent general elections in Vietnam in 1954. It also reported that the POST on the 19th printed documents which disclosed that the Johnson Administration's decision to temporarily stop the bombings of the DRV "was not aimed at having peaceful talks, but was aimed at appeasing public opinion and justifying the U.S. war escalation in Vietnam."

On the 22d, Hanoi said that, according to foreign sources, despite the fact that the "Nixon Administration has strangled the freedom of the press and banned the New York TIMES from continuing to publish" further Pentagon documents, "many papers in Washington and other cities have endeavored to exploit the excerpts of the reports published" in the TIMES. It added that "these papers have advanced new facts to lay bare the systematic U.S. policy of aggression while disclosing some facts in the last part of the report, which were banned from publication by the Nixon Administration, in order to expose Nixon's role" in the U.S. "aggression" in Indochina.

Liberation Radio's initial acknowledgment of the publication came in a Vietnamese-language broadcast on the 17th. Subsequently, the radio publicized the controversy mostly in its English-language broadcasts. However, a Vietnamese-language broadcast on the 22d noted that the U.S. press had continued to publish the Pentagon study despite the Administration's efforts to ban publication and noted that the Boston GLOBE was the third paper to publish portions of the document. Also on the 22d, Liberation Radio and LPA, in their reportage of the second Conference of the International Commission to Investigate U.S. War Crimes which opened in Oslo on the 20th, noted that the general secretary of the commission, Hans Goran Frank, claimed that the recent disclosure of the Pentagon's secret documents "had denounced in part the U.S. acts of war in Indochina."

Vietnamese communist media do not report references to the Pentagon study at the 17 June session of the Paris talks. PRG Foreign Minister Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh brought up the New York TIMES articles in the rebuttal period, but, consistent with standard practice, the VNA account does not report the details: VNA at the end of its account says cryptically that in the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 16 -

rebuttal period Mme. Binh and Xuan Thuy "gave concrete evidences showing that the United States is the aggressor, and that the Nixon Administration is pursuing and expanding its war of aggression."

Also consistent with standard practice, Hanoi media do not publicize the post-session briefing at which PRG spokesman Duong Dinh Thao read Mme. Binh's additional remarks claiming that the secret Pentagon study published by the New York TIMES confirms an "obvious truth which we have pointed out at this conference--that the United States, in the scheme of establishing its neocolonialist domination in South Vietnam, has had plans to gradually provoke and widen the war of aggression."

DRV press spokesman Nguyen Thanh Le at his press briefing on the session indicated that some passages in Xuan Thuy's prepared statement apparently had been intended as an allusion to the controversy over the Pentagon study. Le reported that after Ambassador Bruce made his "additional remarks"--in which he responded to Mme. Binh's remarks on the New York TIMES publications by saying that there was no profit in debating the origins of the war--Xuan Thuy reread passages in his prepared statement that "from the beginning of this conference we have pointed out that the U.S. aggression over the past decades was the root and immediate cause of the present serious situation in Vietnam and Indochina . . ." and that "the Nixon Administration has done its best to deceive public opinion . . ." (These passages were not included in the VNA account of the session, however.)

When Le was asked whether he thought the Pentagon report as published by the New York TIMES proved U.S. violation of the Geneva agreements, he responded by observing that the delegation had copies for the reporters of a DRV White Book issued in 1965. In detailing the "stages" of U.S. intervention, Le said the fifth stage began with President Nixon's assumption of office; Le said that "Nixon has prolonged the aggression" and that in attempting to stop the New York TIMES from publishing the rest of the Pentagon report "he tried to conceal the fact that he has directly participated in and stepped up the war of aggression in Vietnam during the last decades."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 17 -

THE USSR

Since the 15 June TASS item acknowledging the publication of the Pentagon papers, Soviet media have kept up a barrage of propaganda. TASS' editorialized reports charge that the government has "clamped down" on the press and that the pressure has aroused public "indignation," as shown by statements by antiwar leaders and Congressmen. In this connection, commentators ridicule the "free press," U.S. Constitutional guarantees, and the American political system in general. They claim that the "myth" of democracy and of freedom of expression in America is "breaking down." Writing in IZVESTIYA on the 19th, Matveyev compared the New York TIMES to the youthful antiwar demonstrators when he says that the U.S. Government, in enjoining publication of the documents, is now attacking "well-to-do respectable America" as well as the young people for opposing the war. He says that in recent years a number of "eminent U.S. figures who at first supported" the intervention now oppose it, and the "sobering process" has now even affected the New York TIMES, "a big bourgeois press organ."

Both radio and press commentators link the publication of the documents to a top-level political struggle in Washington--a line first advanced in a domestic service commentary by Zorin on the 15th. Panelists in Moscow radio's roundtable program on the 20th discussed whether the publication was inspired by the Republicans or the Democrats. One participant noted that the documents appeared in the New York TIMES, a paper which "usually reflects the mood of the Democratic Party." Another panelist speculated that the publication was "secretly inspired" by the present Administration to discredit its predecessor, and another cited Pierre Salinger as having said that publication of the documents could only help Nixon. One of the panelists said that Ellsberg, suspected of leaking the documents, "is very close to the Nixon entourage." But he went on to cite still another line of speculation to the effect that the publication was directed by "powerful financial circles" who do not wish to protract the war because it is becoming burdensome to the U.S. economy.

Commenting on the difficulty in determining whether it was a supporter of the Democrats or of the Republicans who leaked the documents, a panelist pointed out that members of the Johnson Administration have refused to comment on the publication of the Pentagon report. He noted that former President

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- 18 -

Johnson said he has not commented on anything since his retirement, that former Secretary Rusk also refused comment, and that former Secretary McNamara avoided answering, falling back on the "excuse" that he is now an international civil servant.

A Borovik article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on the 19th also cited Pierre Salinger's remark regarding the documents helping Nixon, as well as New York TIMES' publisher Sulzberger's comment that he did not see what harm the publication could do to the present Administration.

NIXON POLICY Soviet commentators argue that the Nixon Administration cannot dissociate itself from the "deceits" revealed in the secret documents. In a PRAVDA article on the 19th, Ratiani says that history has continued along the same path since 1968; he said that while the incursions into Cambodia and Laos were new actions, there is "evidence" in the press that these operations were prepared by the previous Administration and "passed on." He also said that the present policy of Vietnamization, which is being passed off as an "innovation," is merely a repeat of a policy implemented several years ago which suffered "total failure," as indicated in Secretary McNamara's 21 December 1963 report to the President on the situation in South Vietnam. Ratiani added that for the forthcoming election campaign the Republicans are already resorting to the same tactics used by the Democrats in 1964, trying to "delude" the voters into believing that their main aim is peace while at the same time refusing to discuss a troop withdrawal deadline and threatening to resume massive raids on the DRV and otherwise escalate the war.

Matveyev in IZVESTIYA, also on the 19th, said that "those politicians in Washington who took over the baton of the dirty war in Indochina" are now uncomfortable and embarrassed by the revelation of the Pentagon documents because although the "propaganda flourishes" of this Administration differ from those of its predecessor, the essence of policy is the same--the maintenance of U.S. military force in South Vietnam. But Matveyev added that the situation in the country has changed and that where before the propagandists managed to "get away with it" they are now receiving a "mass rebuff."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 19 -

Dmitriy Volskiy in a NEW TIMES article summarized by the Moscow domestic service on 21 June similarly argued that the documents show that Republicans and Democrats change places, but that policy remains unchanged. The true holder of power in the United States, he said, is the "military-industrial complex" which is the force responsible for the Vietnam adventure. Declaring that the Nixon Administration is trying to imply that it has only an "unhappy legacy," Volskiy said that this is a "poor attempt to put a good face on things. The myth of the Republicans' innocence has now been dissipated."

Documenting their charges that Democrats and Republicans alike have followed the same policy in Indochina, many commentators cite Senator Goldwater's statement that during the 1964 campaign he knew about the secret escalation plans but kept silent. Thus, say the commentators, both parties conspired in deceiving the electorate.

Pointing to the Administration's efforts to dissociate itself from the policies revealed in the documents, a panelist in the 20 June domestic service roundtable said that in his press conference on the 15th Secretary Rogers refused to discuss the documents, remarking that one should leave it to the historians to decide and expressing the hope that the present Administration would go down in history as the one which led the United States out of the war. The panelist called this a "verbal maneuver," charging that under the cover of Vietnamization the present Administration continues and steps up aggression in Southeast Asia.

ATTACKS ON Moscow's reports of extracts of the Pentagon
PRC POLICY documents include references to the Sino-Soviet split. For example, there is passing reference to General Taylor's 22 January 1964 memorandum which said that "economic and agricultural disappointments suffered by Communist China, plus the current rift with the Soviets, could cause the communists to think twice about undertaking a large-scale military adventure in Southeast Asia." Moscow's extracts also include President Johnson's assertion, in his 20 March 1964 telegram to Ambassador Lodge, that he expected "a showdown between the Chinese and Soviet communist parties soon" and that it would be better to adopt action against the DRV after this rather than before.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 20 -

Ratiani in his 19 June PRAVDA article cited President Johnson's telegram in commenting that it showed how Washington strategists were "particularly interested in Peking's policy aimed at exacerbating Soviet-Chinese relations." And several Mandarin-language broadcasts over Radio Moscow and Radio Peace and Progress cite the documents in the course of routine attacks on Peking's refusal to join in united action to aid the Vietnamese. The broadcasts charge once again that the United States took the Chinese anti-Soviet attacks into account when planning its escalation of the war.

A Radio Peace and Progress commentary on the 18th atypically resurrected explicit charges that Peking has obstructed Soviet aid to Vietnam. (Aside from a Radio Peace and Progress broadcast in Mandarin on 5 June on the PRG anniversary which briefly said that the Chinese policy of "vilifying" the Soviet stand on Indochina had caused the people of Southeast Asia to "fail to receive Soviet assistance," the subject has not been raised in available propaganda for nearly a year.) The current broadcast charged that there were "many instances" in which Peking detained and stole Soviet arms and other goods being sent through China to Vietnam, and that it refused to allow a GDR plane loaded with medicine to pass through Chinese airspace. (The episode with the GDR plane had been reported by East Berlin on 12 September 1968, and mentioned by Moscow radio the next day.) The commentary concluded with the assertion that "it is difficult to imagine that the Chinese leaders are unaware of the burden to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of transporting these goods to the Vietnamese people by sea." The "burdens" of sending aid by sea have not been mentioned in Moscow propaganda in years, although in early 1967 there were scattered references to the "vulnerability" of the sea route in the face of the U.S. "sea blockade" of North Vietnam. In 1968 and 1969 Moscow propaganda occasionally referred to Chinese obstruction of Soviet ships carrying aid to Vietnam.

A broadcast in Radio Moscow's regular Mandarin-language service on the 22d sought to make use of the documents to discredit recent U.S. initiatives toward the PRC as well as to press the charge that Peking's divisive policies have abetted U.S. escalation in Indochina. Claiming that the United States follows the imperialist policy of "divide and rule" in Asia, the broadcast cited from the Pentagon study a

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT

25 JUNE 1971

- 21 -

message from the United States to the PRC embassy in Warsaw assuring the Chinese that their territory would not be violated. The broadcast quoted the study as saying this message was sent to forestall Chinese intervention triggered by the bombing of the DRV.

U.S. FOREIGN RELATIONS Some Moscow comment reported foreign governments' concern over the revelations in the Pentagon documents. TASS' initial account of Secretary Rogers' 15 June press conference cited his remark that the publication of the documents "would give a lot of trouble to the United States," but did not explain that he was speaking of relations with foreign governments. However, a Moscow radio broadcast in English to the United Kingdom on the 16th did note that Rogers "admitted" that the publication would "damage U.S. relations with its allies, since an obvious credibility gap is arising." Another broadcast to the same audience later that day cited Rogers' "admission" that "complaints have already been received from a number of countries." A Radio Peace and Progress broadcast in English to Asia on the 17th asserted that the U.S. Government had received "inquiries from certain foreign countries" and added that the State Department expects "a flood of demarches."

A PRAVDA article on the 20th said that the significance of the documents goes beyond U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia, and added that "many people in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now asking how far the U.S. leaders' words can be trusted." It asked if there is not perhaps another volume of documents formulating plans for "unprovoked military intervention in the affairs of Europe or other parts of the world." In this context it cited "U.S. propaganda's" efforts to deny American involvement in the coup in Greece and in a planned rightist coup in Italy in 1964. The article pointed out that the "Western press" is stressing that the publication of the documents is undermining trust in Washington's leaders and policies on the part of "the NATO allies and other countries friendly toward the United States."

An Arabic-language Moscow broadcast on the 23d said that the Pentagon documents expose more clearly the role of American imperialism in the war and asks rhetorically under what cover the "treacherous policy" of the United States will appear next, suggesting that the essence of U.S. actions on Vietnam are also applicable to the Middle East.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 22 -

Some comment strives to implicate U.S. allies in the "policy of deceit." One of the English-language broadcasts to the United Kingdom on the 16th said that the label of "deceit" can also be applied to the British Government since it was, and is, the only big power officially supporting American policy in Indochina. The commentary alleged that the British leaders were informed in confidence that the air raids were being prepared and that they thus must have known that the Tonkin Gulf incident was a "false pretext." TASS on the 17th reported that the Australian Government has begun an investigation into the dispatch of its troops to South Vietnam. It added that the London TIMES has published material proving that the Australian Government, too, misinformed the public about the circumstances linked with the escalation of the Indochina war, sending troops at the "demand" of Ambassador Lodge who visited Canberra in April 1965, rather than at the request of the South Vietnamese Government, as alleged by former Prime Minister Menzies. Moscow English-language broadcasts to Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania on the 19th and 23d similarly said that Australian troops, like the American, moved into Vietnam in accordance with a preplanned program of unprovoked aggression. They assert that Australia was pressured to supply "cannonfodder" by the Americans, and that the Australian soldiers, like the Americans, have "died in vain."

A Korean-language Moscow broadcast on the 23d, noting Seoul's failure to comment on the publication of the Pentagon documents, said that the South Korean leaders who have sent 55,000 South Korean soldiers to South Vietnam are "blinded by gold" and do not want a political settlement in Vietnam. The commentator asserted that they remain silent because they fear that if U.S. objectives in South Vietnam and the purpose of Seoul's participation became known to the world, "there might be another popular uprising against the government."

Moscow first acknowledged the fact that the Pentagon report revealed that Canadian ICC representative Seaborn delivered messages from the United States to the DRV in PRAVDA on the 17th. Extracts of the documents printed in the paper that day noted without comment that immediately after Congress adopted the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the Administration sent Seaborn to Hanoi to warn the North Vietnamese that they would "suffer the consequences" if they continued to attempt

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 23 -

to "develop subversive activities and strive to subjugate South Vietnam and Laos." The only available comment thus far came in a Moscow broadcast in English to North America on the 23d which charged that the White House used "deceit" to draw other countries into its war ventures. Among others, it cited the example of the "complicity" of the former Canadian government led by Lester Pearson, and quoted the Toronto GLOBE, commenting on Seaborn's trips to Hanoi, as concluding that this secret activity was "not compatible with neutrality," and would not have been approved of by the Canadian people had they been aware of the facts.

Moscow also briefly reported, without comment, that the documents revealed that the United States had devoted attention to the possible reaction of the USSR to the beginning of the bombing. Both PRAVDA on the 18th and Radio Peace and Progress on the 21st, in publicizing extracts of the documents, reported that a White House telegram to Ambassador Taylor on 13 February 1965 expressed determination to continue actions against the DRV regardless of UN Security Council deliberations, but at the same time considered a Security Council initiative after another strike to be essential "if we are to avoid being faced with really damaging initiatives by the USSR or perhaps by such powers as India, France, or even the United Nations." PRAVDA also cited National Security Council Memorandum 328 of 6 April 1965 which, among other things, pointed to the need to consider "complications" with regard to the Soviet Union if North Vietnamese ports were mined.

THE PRC AND NORTH KOREA

As of 1400 GMT 24 June, both Peking and Pyongyang have remained silent on the publication of the Pentagon materials. It is not unusual for Peking to take its time in examining a development before reacting, and this tendency may have been reinforced by the possibility of the release of additional material after the case has been adjudicated. It is also conceivable that Peking may be embarrassed by the support lent by portions of the documents to Moscow's charge that Chinese refusal to put up a united front contributed to escalation of hostilities in Vietnam. As for Pyongyang, which has moved notably closer to Peking in the past year or so, it may have deferred reacting to publication of the documents until Peking makes the first move.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY FBIS REACTION REPORT
25 JUNE 1971

- 24 -

There has been reaction from two communist clandestine radios sponsored by Peking and Pyongyang. The pro-Peking Thai Communist Party's Voice of the People of Thailand in a broadcast on 22 June said the documents show how "deceitful and distorted" U.S. official statements on Indochina have been. The broadcast noted that publication of the documents has created a quarrel between the government and its opponents in the United States. A broadcast to South Korea on the 19th by the Voice of the Revolutionary Party for Reunification said the documents indicate that the United States has been the aggressor in Vietnam and the source of the war's escalation.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0

- 25 -

EAST EUROPE

POLAND Warsaw has covered the publication of the documents chiefly in reportage from Polish news agency correspondents in the United States. The most authoritative among the few Warsaw commentaries is an article in the party daily TRYBUNA LUDU on the 19th stating that the documents provide a picture of "colossal political frauds" by successive administrations designed to mask "the brutal intervention" in Indochina by the use of lofty slogans about freedom and democracy. An article in GROS PRACY on the 17th claimed that the greatest shock caused by the documents was not the disclosure that successive U.S. administrations "planned aggressive war against Vietnam," but that the American leaders "systematically deceived" both the Congress and the American people. The paper found it noteworthy that the "aggressive acts" against Vietnam were carried out in defiance of the advice of the intelligence community and concluded that the Pentagon put such pressure on the Administration that it not only agreed to "the adventures but also gave its protective shield to them."

EAST GERMANY East German media having been mainly preoccupied with coverage of the SED Congress, comment from the GDR on the Pentagon documents has been sparse but characteristically hostile, playing the theme that the documents constitute an indictment of current Administration policy on Vietnam. An article in the party organ NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on the 20th charged that U.S. Presidents from Kennedy to Nixon are guilty of the very same thing for which the Hitler regime was convicted at Nuernberg: "the long-term preparation of a war of aggression and the simultaneous deception of an entire people." The East Berlin radio's Albert Reisz on the 16th perceived a "diabolical continuity" in U.S. foreign policy from Truman to Nixon--"a policy of the imperialist lust for power." Another East Berlin radio commentator on the 17th likened the Tonkin Gulf incident to the Nazi attack on the Gleiwitz transmitter, which Hitler used as a pretext to invade Poland. He then briefly reviewed the alleged duplicity of both the Johnson and Nixon administrations regarding Vietnam and concluded that "the Johnsons and the Nixons are liars of the same caliber." On 18 June the same commentator explained the court battle over publication as an effort by the U.S. Government to

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 26 -

halt publication in "a desperate attempt to continue 'operation big deception' and to bring under control the profound crisis of confidence that is shaking the entire American people."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA Extensive reportage and hostile comment from Czechoslovakia, reflecting the present conservative tenor of Prague propaganda, has made use of the Vietnam study to discredit U.S. political institutions and the Nixon Administration's policy on Indochina. A Prague radio commentary on 16 June argued that the Administration's objections to the publication of the documents stem from a fear that they will show that there is little difference between President Nixon's and President Johnson's policy, for "both have been engaged in a war in violation of the Constitution and are guilty of deceit." Similarly, Radio Prague's domestic service on the 17th claimed that the Nixon Administration's reaction to publication of the documents proves that some aspects of Johnson's policy "were fully adopted by the present Republican Administration."

The party daily RUDE PRAVO argued on the 17th that "one shockingly true fact" can be deduced from the documents: "The honeyed words pronounced in defense of democracy, of the free world and the like" that characterize all presidential speeches on Indochina are aimed at "covering up the blood stains on the American policy in Indochina." The same paper commented on the next day that the primary issue now is freedom of the press, since censorship in this case may prevent similar disclosures by the press in the future.

HUNGARY Budapest's comment links the documents to current U.S. policy in Vietnam as well as to the U.S. presidential elections. An article in the party organ NEPSZABADSAG on the 20th interpreted the Nixon Administration's response to the publication of the papers as "new proof" that it has not only inherited the Vietnam policy but also adopted it. In the same vein, a Budapest radio commentator on the 15th suggested that the U.S. Government is attempting to halt publication because the documents would show that there is "a perfect continuity in the policies of the Johnson and Nixon Administrations," adding that "a couple of years ago Mr. Johnson of the Democratic Party made a reality of what was demanded by Mr. Goldwater of the Republican Party, and now the Republican Nixon government makes use of the whole apparatus of power in defense of those who pushed the United States into a war in Vietnam."

- 27 -

A commentary on the 18th viewed the publication of the documents as a prelude to next year's presidential elections, but it went on to argue that the Nixon Administration is following the same policies pursued by its predecessor, showing that nothing has been learned from "the mistakes of the Johnson policy." An article in the daily MAGYAR NEMZET on 18 June also raised the election issue, speculating that former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford might go on trial so that the Nixon Administration might present its program to the voters in a more favorable light.

BULGARIA Sofia's initial treatment of the Pentagon papers relied chiefly on reports from Western and communist news agencies while avoiding original comment. However, on the 19th, taking its cue from Moscow, the party daily RABOTNICHESKO DELO began publishing installments of a PRAVDA account of the New York TIMES articles and the central press offered comment along the line that the documents' publication unmasked the true aims of U.S. Vietnam policy. An article in OTECHESTVEN FRONT on the 20th said that "now the entire propaganda structure with which the United States camouflaged the true goals of the aggression has been crushed." It added: "Now it has become clear that the task was to stop the progressive and free development of the peoples of the Indochina peninsula, transform their countries into a base for expanding the domination of the Pacific, and create loyal neocolonialist states which could support the reactionary police role in that part of the world."

Similar articles in Sofia's TRUD, NARODNA ARMIYA, and ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME, carried on the 19th, elaborated on the theme that "never has U.S. imperialist policy been displayed so nakedly as now with the publication of these documents." The Bulgarian press has also made the point that regardless of the outcome of the court decision on further publication of the papers, "even the small part published is sufficient to make Nixon's silent majority speak up and say its piece."

ROMANIA Bucharest's coverage of the documents' publication has been largely reportorial and devoid of editorial comment. The only monitored commentary was a broadcast by Bucharest on the 19th which reviewed government efforts to stop publication of the documents and added: "The conclusions which emerge from the series of articles published by the large American dailies are significant not only for the way in which the U.S. Administration

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 28 -

assumed the responsibility for preparing the military intervention in Vietnam without taking any moral considerations or the future consequences of their actions into account, but they also stirred American public opinion, which was in a position to judge the amplitude of the misinformation." Continuing in a restrained tone, the commentator observed that "the fact has now been established that the American Administration did not tell the whole truth in connection with the motives and extent of the implications of the Vietnam war." The closest the commentator came to drawing implications from the publication of the documents for present U.S. policy was a bland remark that "at present, when U.S. policy in that part of the world is so strongly contested even within the United States itself, this event is naturally arousing special interest."

YUGOSLAVIA Yugoslav media have hailed the publication of the Vietnam documents and some see it as an opportunity for the Administration to disengage more rapidly from Indochina. An article in the daily BORBA on the 19th said the publication of the papers revealed "the biggest deception" of the U.S. Congress and of American and world public opinion that has come to light. Another article on the 20th praised the New York TIMES for rendering a great service to the cause of information by "the publication of the facts of the widest interest and importance."

The Belgrade daily POLITIKA on the 16th observed that "in some ways the affair is a welcome event for the Administration, enabling it to even more clearly dissociate itself from the period of the Democratic Administration and win the support of the widest public for its action of shedding the American commitments and for 'Vietnamization.'" Similarly, Zagreb's daily VJESNIK said that the really important question now is "how will Nixon make good the chance, no matter whether he himself created it or others offered it to him?"

Another prominent theme in Yugoslav comment has been the issue of freedom of the press, allegedly raised by the U.S. Government's efforts to prevent publication of the documents on security grounds. The more free-wheeling Yugoslav papers clearly have used the issue for their own purposes, but the semiofficial BORBA on the 21st cautioned that attention to this issue could divert attention from the main topic: "the U.S. aggression in Vietnam."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS-REAGAN REPORT

25 JUNE 1971

- 29 -

ALBANIA Tirana remained all but silent on the Pentagon documents until the 22d, when the domestic radio broadcast a commentary entitled "Washington is in Panic" which typically depicted the United States as being in an advanced state of crisis over publication of the study. As if to explain Tirana's minimal attention to the affair, the commentator pointed out that the Albanian people were "not surprised by the scandal in Washington, because our party and people have told the people about events in Vietnam; they have unmasked the U.S. aggressors for a long time." The commentator acknowledged, however, that the documents are of some interest because they "show that this time there are Western leaders themselves who admit the true history of the dirty war in Vietnam." He added that the documents also show "the true face of U.S. imperialism, which has committed horrible crimes under the cloak of a lamb." Sounding a familiar propaganda theme that there are no differences between political parties in the capitalist world, the commentator concluded that "all U.S. administrations follow a common policy, the escalation of aggression, and the noise about peace has been nothing but a screen to hide a global strategy."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 30 -

CUBA

Havana reacted to the publication of the Pentagon documents and to the ensuing court battles with substantial reportage and comment on each development of what it labels a "worldwide scandal." Stressing that the disclosures merely confirmed long-held beliefs, the commentaries have focused on two aspects of the "scandal"--that which is inherent in what the documents are said to prove and that which has been brought about by the "unprecedented" efforts of the Administration to stop the publication of additional documents. Havana has emphasized continuities between policies of past administrations disclosed in the documents and the President's Vietnamization program.

The Pentagon study "contains undeniable facts," a Havana television commentator remarked on 17 June, "that confirm what everybody knows"--that "U.S. Government leaders, without the consent of Congress and the people, launched an aggression against Vietnam by using previously well-prepared and coldly executed provocations," that they "systematically have withheld the truth from the people and Congress," and that they have "resorted to lies and deceit." In a similar vein a Radio Havana international broadcast in Spanish on the 22d contended that the documents "do not reveal anything new" but "simply prove with concrete and irrefutable evidence the treacherous and deceitful policy which led to Yankee genocide in Vietnam." A commentary on the 21st on the Cuban Armed Forces political information program observed that publication of the documents does not constitute "an exposé" but "indisputable evidence" of the "cynical, hypocritical, and treacherous policies of Yankee imperialism."

Arguing that the documents reveal nothing essentially new, Havana has derided the U.S. Government's claim of potential damage to national security from their release. A vitriolic commentary broadcast in Spanish to Latin American listeners on the 22d declared that the documents "do not reveal diplomatic secrets" but "crimes, provocations deliberately planned, and a rapacious and adventurous policy, covered with lies to deceive the people and the Congress of the United States" and "the history of a group of leaders who turned into war criminals, guilty of the same crimes which were punished in Nuernberg by hanging."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 31 -

The Administration's efforts to prevent further publication of the documents are seen to be closely linked with the President's current Vietnam policies. Thus a TV commentary on the 17th observed that although the publication of the documents "apparently affects Nixon and the Republican Party in a very limited degree," the President "reacted in a significant manner which increases the magnitude of the scandal." His reaction, according to the commentary, was responsive to the documents' character as a "categorical and undeniable demonstration of the treacherous and criminal characteristics of U.S. policies--policies which are still in force in the Nixon Administration." Following a similar line, an internationally broadcast commentary on the 22d contended that "the disclosures made by the documents indirectly condemn Nixon's present policy," asking "what difference is there" between the Gulf of Tonkin incident and "Nixon's lies" justifying the Cambodian and Laotian "invasions," between "Johnson's lies to intensify the war and Nixon's lies to extend and indefinitely prolong the war"? And a signed article in the 22 June edition of GRANMA, the party organ, suggested that the Administration's effort to prevent further publication of the documents is "intended to prevent loss of confidence in President Richard Nixon's Administration, which is also deceiving public opinion on the same subject."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0

Approved For Release 2002/07/02 : CIA-RDP86B00269R001400140001-0